



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/468,222	12/20/1999	DAVID ALLEN	002880.P001C	3372

7590 10/27/2003

James H Salter  
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
----------

LE, UYEN T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2171

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

10

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/468,222

Applicant(s)

ALLEN ET AL.

Examiner

Uyen T Le

Art Unit

2171

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. Applicant's amendment to claim 5 is acknowledged. Consequently, rejection to claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is withdrawn.
2. Applicant's arguments regarding Furusawa and Leong have been fully considered but they are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection presented in this Office Action.
3. Applicant argues that Register does not teach or suggest identifying an information object associated with the at least one keyword and associating the information object associated with the keyword with the input text. In response, the claimed features are met by the fact that the method of Register identifies which categories are most similar to the recognized keywords of the natural language input text (see the abstract,, Figures 2, 3, 5).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1, 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a), (e) as being anticipated by Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record.

Regarding claim 9, Register discloses all the claimed subject matter including receiving natural language text, parsing to identify keywords within the input text, identifying an information object associated with the keywords and associating the information object associated with the keyword with the input text (see the abstract, Figures 2, 3, 5). The claimed information object associated with the keywords reads on the categories in the method of Register. The claimed associating the information object with the input text reads on the fact that the input text is categorized.

Claim 1 corresponds to a system for claim 9, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 9 above. Furthermore, the claimed user output device is met by display 18 (see Figure 1).

5. Claims 2, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record.

Regarding claim 11, Register discloses storing a plurality of information objects, associated keywords and supplemental information related to the information objects when Register shows that the list of most similar categories, the list of extracted keywords and the list of deduced facts are passed to the feedback learning module (see column 5, lines 62-67). Although Register does not specifically show displaying the supplemental information on the user output device upon request, it would have been

Art Unit: 2171

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include such features in order to display supplemental information for user's intervention whenever needed.

Claim 2 corresponds to a system for claim 11, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 11 above.

6. Claims 3, 12, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record, in view of Gladden (US 5,765,028) of record.

Regarding claim 12, although Register does not specifically show that the user input device is an email program, it is well known in the art as shown by Gladden to use an email program as an user input device to request information (see the abstract). Since the system of Register processes input text expressions, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include an email program as user input device as taught by Gladden in order to provide more options to enter the input text.

Claim 3 corresponds to a system for claim 12, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 12 above.

Claim 17 essentially recites the limitations of claims 1 and 3, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 1 and 3 above.

7. Claims 4, 10, 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record, in view of Tso (US 6,085,201) of record.

Regarding claim 10, although Register does not explicitly show that the keywords are recognized based on context, it is well known in the art to recognize text based on

Art Unit: 2171

context as shown by Tso (see the abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature in the system of Register in order to accurately determine the input expression.

Claim 4 corresponds to a system for claim 10, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 10 above.

Claim 18 recites the same limitations of claim 4, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 4 above.

8. Claims 5-8, 13-16, 19, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al (US 5,371,807) of record, in view of Webster et al (US 6,052,121).

Regarding claim 13, although Register does not explicitly show a keyword of name of persons, it is well known in the art to use a name of a person as keyword as shown by Webster (see Figure 8, column 9, lines 6-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature while implementing the method of Register in order to identify information related to a person as shown by Webster.

Regarding claim 14, although Register does not explicitly show that the information objects comprise email addresses, it is well known in the art for information object to include email addresses as shown by Webster (see Figure 8, column 9, lines 6-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include

the claimed feature while implementing the method of Register in order to allow searching for a person's email address as shown by Webster.

Regarding claim 15, the claimed feature merely reads on the fact that in the method of Register, the categories related to the input text are stored separately from the input text expression.

Regarding claim 16, although Register does not explicitly show that the information objects are in a contacts database, it is well known in the art as shown by Webster to store information objects in a contact database (see Figure 8, column 9, lines 6-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the claimed feature while implementing the method of Register in order to facilitate searching as shown by Webster.

Claims 5-8 correspond respectively to a system for claims 13-16, thus are rejected for the same reasons stated in claims 13-16 above.

Claim 19 recites the same limitations of claim 14, thus is rejected for the same reasons stated in claim 14 above.

Regarding claim 20, Register discloses the claimed application having a plurality of information objects (see the abstract). Furthermore, the information objects in the database have to be associated with the keywords for the parser to identify the proper categories.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

Art Unit: 2171

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Uyen T Le whose telephone number is 703-305-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Uyen Le  
Primary Examiner  
AU 2171

14 October 2003